

Fermi edge restoration in the Tomonaga-Luttinger model with impurities

C.M.Naón, M.C.von Reichenbach and M.L.Trobo

Depto. de Física. Universidad Nacional de La Plata.

CC 67, 1900 La Plata, Argentina.

Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Argentina.

(October 1995)

Abstract

We study the Tomonaga-Luttinger model in the presence of magnetic (Kondo-like) impurities. By using a recently proposed field-theoretical approach to non-local bosonization we obtain the effective action describing the low-energy charge and spin density fluctuations. From this action the dispersion relations of the collective modes are readily found. We also compute the momentum distribution and show that the electron-impurity scattering allows to have restoration of the Fermi liquid behavior.(Contact naon@venus.fisica.unlp.edu.ar).

PACS numbers: 11.10.Lm, 05.30.Fk, 72.15.Nj, La Plata TH 95 28

Recent advances in the field of nanofabrication have allowed to build ultranarrow semiconductor structures in which the motion of the electrons is confined to one dimension [1] . These developments have triggered an intense experimental [2] and theoretical [3] activity in the last few years.

One of the main tools for the theoretical study of the one-dimensional (1D) electron system is the Tomonaga-Luttinger model (TL) [4]- [5] which describes a non-relativistic gas of massless particles with linearized free dispersion relation and two-body interactions. This model displays the so called Luttinger liquid (LL) behavior [6] : the jump discontinuity in the electron momentum distribution is washed out as soon as the interaction is switched on, even at $T = 0$. Therefore, based on this model one would expect that the experimental results should indicate a clear deviation from the normal Fermi liquid behavior (FL). However, the available experimental data are consistent with the existence of the edge singularity in the momentum distribution [7] .This fact raises an interesting question concerning the validity of the TL model as a description of real 1D systems.

The main purpose of this letter is to show how the TL model can be easily modified in order to have a restoration of the Fermi edge singularity. To this end we shall use a recently proposed path-integral approach to non-local bosonization [8]. In this framework the usual TL action can be expressed as certain limit of a non-local QFT in which non-locality allows to consider general potentials responsible for the two-body interactions. What we do here is to add a Kondo-like term to the usual electron-electron scattering term of the TL model and show under which conditions the presence of a magnetic impurity can lead to normal FL behavior. Although the role of impurities in the reappearance of the Fermi surface has been previously examined in another model [9], we think it is specially relevant to have the possibility of such a mechanism within the context of a well established exactly soluble system like the TL model.

Following the lines of Ref [8] we consider the action

$$S = \int d^2x [\bar{\Psi} i \not{\partial} \Psi - \int d^2y J_\mu^a(x) V_{(\mu)}^{ab}(x, y) J_\mu^b(y) - \int d^2y J_\mu^a(x) U_{(\mu)}^{ab}(x, y) S_\mu^b(y) + d^\dagger i \partial_t d], \quad (1)$$

where

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the electron field ($\Psi_1(\Psi_2)$ is associated to right (left) movers),

$$d = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 \\ d_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

represents an impurity field with vanishing kinetic energy [10], and

$$J_\mu^a = \bar{\Psi} \gamma_\mu \lambda^a \Psi,$$

$$S_\mu^a = \bar{d} \gamma_\mu \lambda^a d,$$

with $\lambda^a (a = 0, 1, 2, 3)$ the $U(2)$ generators related to charge and spin conservation. As shown in [8], the action (1) with $U_{(\mu)} = 0$, describes the zero-temperature TL model when only forward scattering diagrams are taken into account. (For simplicity we set $v_F = 1$ and $p_F = 0$. The dependence on the Fermi momentum p_F will be consider later. See eq.(11)). If we disregard spin-flipping processes we can restrict our analysis to the maximal Abelian subgroup of $U(2)$, generated by λ^0 and λ^1 . The two-body potential matrices are diagonal whose elements can be written in terms of the g-functions defined by Sólyom [11] as

$$\begin{aligned} V_{(0)}^{00} &= \frac{1}{4}(g_{4\parallel} + g_{4\perp} + g_{2\parallel} + g_{2\perp}), \\ V_{(0)}^{11} &= \frac{1}{4}(g_{4\parallel} - g_{4\perp} + g_{2\parallel} - g_{2\perp}), \\ V_{(1)}^{00} &= \frac{1}{4}(-g_{4\parallel} - g_{4\perp} + g_{2\parallel} + g_{2\perp}), \\ V_{(1)}^{11} &= \frac{1}{4}(-g_{4\parallel} + g_{4\perp} + g_{2\parallel} - g_{2\perp}). \end{aligned}$$

The TL model, with charge-density fluctuations only, corresponds to $V_{(0)}^{11} = V_{(1)}^{11} = 0$. In a completely analogous way we introduce the potentials that couple electron and impurity currents in the form

$$\begin{aligned} U_{(0)}^{00} &= \frac{1}{4}(h_{4\parallel} + h_{4\perp} + h_{2\parallel} + h_{2\perp}), \\ U_{(0)}^{11} &= \frac{1}{4}(h_{4\parallel} - h_{4\perp} + h_{2\parallel} - h_{2\perp}), \\ U_{(1)}^{00} &= \frac{1}{4}(-h_{4\parallel} - h_{4\perp} + h_{2\parallel} + h_{2\perp}), \\ U_{(1)}^{11} &= \frac{1}{4}(-h_{4\parallel} + h_{4\perp} + h_{2\parallel} - h_{2\perp}). \end{aligned}$$

This description includes both charge and spin density interactions. The Kondo interaction, i.e. the coupling between spin densities only, corresponds to the case $U_{(0)}^{00} = U_{(1)}^{00} = 0$.

Let us now consider the partition function of the system

$$Z = \int D\bar{\Psi}D\Psi D\bar{d}dDa \exp - [S + \int d^2x a(d^\dagger d - n)], \quad (2)$$

where S is given by (1) and a is a Lagrange multiplier that fixes the impurity number to n . (Please see [10] for details concerning the treatment of the impurity). Exactly as we did in [8] for the “clean” system ($U_{(\mu)} = 0$), we express (2) in terms of fermionic determinants. This can be achieved by introducing auxiliary vector fields A_μ, B_μ . After some standard manipulations we get

$$Z = \int DADB e^{-S'[A,B]} \det(i\cancel{D} - \sqrt{2} \cancel{A}) \det(i\gamma_0 \partial_t - \cancel{B}), \quad (3)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} S'[A, B] &= \int d^2x d^2y [\sqrt{2} B_\mu^a(x) a_{(\mu)}^{ab}(x, y) A_\mu^b(y) - \\ &\quad - B_\mu^a(x) \int d^2u d^2v a_{(\mu)}^{ac}(x, u) (b_{(\mu)}^{-1})^{cd}(u, v) a_{(\mu)}^{db}(v, y) B_\mu^b(y)], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we have defined the inverse potentials $a_{(\mu)}$ and $b_{(\mu)}$ through the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^2u V_{(\mu)}^{ac}(x, u) b_{(\mu)}^{cd}(u, y) &= \delta^{ad} \delta^2(x - y), \\ \int d^2u U_{(\mu)}^{ac}(x, u) a_{(\mu)}^{cd}(u, y) &= \delta^{ad} \delta^2(x - y). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The fermionic determinant involving the field A_μ can be readily computed by well-known path-integral techniques [12] based on the change

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi &= e^{-\sqrt{2}(\gamma_5 \Phi + i\eta)} \chi, \\ \bar{\Psi} &= \bar{\chi} e^{-\sqrt{2}(\gamma_5 \Phi - i\eta)}, \\ A_\mu &= \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \Phi + \partial_\mu \eta,\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

with $\Phi = \Phi^a \lambda^a, \eta = \eta^a \lambda^a$.

The result is

$$\det(i\cancel{\partial} - \sqrt{2} \not{A}) = (\det i\cancel{\partial}) \exp \frac{1}{\pi} \int d^2x \Phi \square \Phi.$$

Concerning the determinant associated with the impurity, its evaluation is more subtle. However, we were able to extend the standard technique [12] to solve this particular problem. (The details of this calculation will be reported elsewhere. An alternative treatment can be found in [10]). We thus get

$$\begin{aligned}\det(i\gamma_0 \partial_t - \not{B}) &= \det(i\gamma_0 \partial_t) \exp \frac{-1}{4\pi} \int d^2x \{B_0^2 - B_1^2 + \\ &+ \int d^2y \Theta(x_0 - y_0) \partial_x \delta(x_1 - y_1) [B_0(x) B_1(y) + B_1(x) B_0(y)]\}.\end{aligned}$$

Putting all this together and going to momentum space one gets a bosonic action depending on Φ and η (the collective modes) and the impurity variables B_0 and B_1 . These last fields, in turn, can be easily integrated out. Thus, we finally obtain

$$Z = \int D\Phi D\eta \exp - \{S_{eff}^{00} + S_{eff}^{11}\},\tag{7}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}S_{eff}^{ii} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^2p [\Phi^i(p) A^{ii}(p) \Phi^i(-p) + \eta^i(p) B^{ii}(p) \eta^i(-p) + \\ &+ \Phi^i(p) \frac{C^{ii}(p)}{2} \eta^i(-p) + \eta^i(p) \frac{C^{ii}(p)}{2} \Phi^i(-p)],\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A(p) &= \frac{1}{\Delta(p)} \left\{ \frac{p^2}{\pi} \Delta - a_0 a_1 \frac{p_1^2}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2\pi} (a_0^2 p_1^2 - a_1^2 p_0^2) - 2a_0^2 a_1^2 \left(\frac{p_1^2}{b_1} + \frac{p_0^2}{b_0} \right) \right\}, \\
B(p) &= \frac{1}{\Delta(p)} \left\{ \frac{p_1^2}{\pi} a_0 a_1 + \frac{1}{2\pi} (a_0^2 p_0^2 - a_1^2 p_1^2) - 2a_0^2 a_1^2 \left(\frac{p_1^2}{b_0} + \frac{p_0^2}{b_1} \right) \right\}, \\
C(p) &= \frac{1}{\Delta(p)} \left\{ \frac{a_0 a_1}{\pi} \left(\frac{p_1^3}{p_0} - p_0 p_1 \right) + \frac{p_0 p_1}{\pi} (a_0^2 + a_1^2) + 4p_0 p_1 a_0^2 a_1^2 \left(\frac{1}{b_0} - \frac{1}{b_1} \right) \right\}, \\
\Delta(p) &= \frac{p_1^2}{4\pi^2 p_0^2} + 4 \left(\frac{1}{4\pi} - \frac{a_1^2}{b_1} \right) \left(\frac{1}{4\pi} + \frac{a_0^2}{b_0} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the sake of clarity we have omitted *ii* superindices in the above expressions, which are written in terms of the Fourier transforms of the inverse potentials defined in (5). (Note that $b_\mu(p) = V_{(\mu)}^{-1}(p)$ and $a_\mu(p) = U_{(\mu)}^{-1}(p)$).

Eqs (7) and (8) are our first non-trivial results. Indeed, we have obtained a completely bosonized action describing the dynamics of charge density (CDW) and spin density (SDW) excitations (associated with the fields Φ^0, η^0 and Φ^1, η^1 respectively). As we can see from (7), these modes remain decoupled as in the impurity free case. The dispersion relations are given by

$$\omega^2(q) = q^2 \frac{1 + \frac{2}{\pi} V_{(0)} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} (U_{(0)}^2 - 2U_{(0)} U_{(1)})}{1 + \frac{2}{\pi} V_{(1)} - \frac{1}{2\pi^2} U_{(1)}^2}, \quad (9)$$

where, once again, we have omitted 00 (11) superindices in the potentials, corresponding to CDW's (SDW's). We have also gone back to real frequencies: $p_0 = i\omega$, $p_1 = q$.

From now on we shall specialize the discussion to the TL model with a Kondo-like interaction. Thus, we set

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{(0)}^{11} &= V_{(1)}^{11} = 0 = U_{(0)}^{00} = U_{(1)}^{00}, \\
\frac{2}{\pi} V_{(0)}^{00} &= r, \\
\frac{2}{\pi} V_{(1)}^{00} &= s, \\
(U_{(0)}^{11})^2 &= (U_{(1)}^{11})^2 = 2\pi^2 t.
\end{aligned}$$

For repulsive electron-electron interaction one has $r > 0$ and $s > 0$, whereas $t > 0$ for both ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic Kondo coupling. In order to study the momentum

distribution we compute the fermionic 2-point function. To be specific we consider $G_{1\uparrow}$ (similar expressions are obtained for $G_{2\uparrow}$, $G_{1\downarrow}$ and $G_{2\downarrow}$),

$$\begin{aligned} G_{1\uparrow}(x, y) &= \langle \Psi_{1\uparrow}(x) \Psi_{1\uparrow}^\dagger(y) \rangle \\ &= G_{1\uparrow}^{(0)}(x, y) \langle e^{\sqrt{2}\{[\Phi^0(y)-\Phi^0(x)]+i[\eta^0(y)-\eta^0(x)]\}} \rangle_{00} \times \\ &\times \langle e^{\sqrt{2}\{[\Phi^1(y)-\Phi^1(x)]+i[\eta^1(y)-\eta^1(x)]\}} \rangle_{11}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where we have used (6) to relate $G_{1\uparrow}$ with the free propagator $G_{1\uparrow}^{(0)}$, in which the Fermi momentum p_F is easily incorporated [8]. The symbol $\langle \rangle_{ii}$ means v.e.v. with respect to the action (8). Taking the limit $z_0 \rightarrow 0$ ($z = x - y$) in (10) and inserting the result in the definition of the momentum distribution $N_{1\uparrow}(q)$, one gets

$$N_{1\uparrow}(q) = C(\Lambda) \int dz_1 \frac{e^{-i(q-p_F)z_1}}{z_1} e^{-\int dp_1 \frac{1-\cos p_1 z_1}{p_1} \Gamma(p_1)}, \quad (11)$$

where $C(\Lambda)$ is a normalization constant depending on an ultraviolet cutoff Λ , and $\Gamma(p_1)$ depends on p_1 through the potentials in the form

$$\Gamma(r, s, t) = f(r, 0) + f(s, t) - h(s, t). \quad (12)$$

In the above equation we have defined the functions

$$f(s, t) = \frac{(|1+s-t|^{1/2} - |1-t|^{1/2})^2}{|1+s-t|^{1/2} |1-t|^{1/2}}, \quad (13)$$

$$h(s, t) = \frac{2t(t-t_c)}{|1+s-t|^{3/2} |1-t|^{1/2}}, \quad (14)$$

with $t_c = 9/8 - 1/2(s - 1/2)^2$.

We have now reached the main point of our discussion. We want to determine under which conditions it is possible to have $\Gamma(r, s, t) = 0$, since in this case one immediately has $N_{1\uparrow}(q) \propto \Theta(q-p_F)$, i.e. normal FL behavior. First of all we note that for $t = 0$ (impurity free case) $\Gamma(r, s, 0)$ cannot vanish for any value of r and s other than $r = s = 0$, which corresponds to the non-interacting Fermi gas. On the other hand, the first two terms in (12) are positive definite. This means that the only chance to obtain $\Gamma = 0$, in a non-trivial (interacting)

situation, is to have $t > t_c$. This necessary condition determines a “critical” parabola in the space of potentials, $t(s) = t_c$, below which FL behavior is forbidden. Enforcing also the condition $\omega^2 > 0$ in (9), in order to have normal modes with real frequencies, one finds two disjoint regions where the FL edge could be, in principle, restored: $t > 1 + s$ and $t < 1, t > t_c$. However, one also has to satisfy $f(r, 0) > 0$, which for $\Gamma = 0$ yields

$$F(s, t) = h(s, t) - f(s, t) > 0. \quad (15)$$

A simple numerical analysis of $F(s, t)$ shows that the above inequality is not fulfilled for $0 < t < 1$. The electron-impurity coupling is not strong enough in this region as to eliminate the LL behavior. On the contrary, for $t > 1 + s$ equation (15) can be always satisfied. Moreover, in this region, for $\Gamma = 0$ we obtain the following analytical solution for r in terms of $F(s, t)$:

$$r = F^2/2 + 2F + (1 + F/2)(F^2 + 4F)^{1/2}. \quad (16)$$

To illustrate this result it is useful to consider the local case, corresponding to contact interactions (r, s and t are constants). From the precedent discussion we conclude that for $0 < t < 1$ (region I) one necessarily has LL behavior, whereas for $t > s + 1$ (region III) FL behavior is admitted. (See Fig. 1). Note that for $1 < t < s + 1$ (region II) the frequency of the SDW's becomes imaginary. Let us stress that, for $t > s + 1$, Eq(16) defines a surface in the space of potentials on which FL behavior takes place. This is our main result. One particular solution belonging to this “FL surface” is obtained by choosing $s = 0$ in (16), which yields

$$r(t) = \frac{2t(3t - 2) + 2(2t - 1)\sqrt{3t^2 - 2t}}{(t - 1)^2}.$$

This curve corresponds to the case in which the SDW's dispersion relation is given by $\omega^2 = q^2$. For t large r approaches a minimum value $r_{min} = 6 + 4\sqrt{3}$, a feature that is shared with each curve on the FL surface.

In summary, we have studied a simple modification of the TL model that describes the

interaction of electrons with localized magnetic impurities at zero temperature. By using a recently proposed field-theoretical path-integral approach that enables us to treat non-local interactions [8], we were able to obtain a completely bosonized effective action that governs the dynamics of the collective modes of our model (Eqs. (8), (9)). This action, in turn, allowed us to compute the electron momentum distribution (Eq.(11)). Finally, by analyzing this result we have found one region in the space of potentials in which the FL behavior can be recovered as an effect of the interaction between the electrons and the magnetic impurities. Thus, we have presented a qualitative scheme that could be useful in the understanding of highly correlated 1D systems, in terms of the well-known TL model.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are partially supported by Fundación Antorchas (Buenos Aires, Argentina) under grant A-13218/1-000069.

REFERENCES

- [1] S.B Kaplan and A.Harstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2403 (1986);
W.J.Skocpol et al, ibid 56, 2865 (1986);
A.B.Fowler et al, ibid 57, 138 (1986);
For reviews, see Physics and Technology of Submicron Structures, edited by H.Heinrich,
G.Bauer and F.Kuchar, Springer series in Solid-State Sciences Vol 83 (Springer-Verlag,
Berlin, 1988);
Nanostructure Physics and Fabrication, edited by M.Reed and W.Kirk (Academic,
Boston, 1989);
Solid State Physics: Semiconductor Heterostructures and Nanostructures, C.W.J.
Beenakker and H.van Houten,(Academic, Boston, 1991).
- [2] W.Hansen et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** 2586 (1987);
T.Daniel et al, Phys. Rev. B **38** 12732 (1988);
C.H.Siroski and U.Merkt, Phys. Rev. Lett **62** 2164 (1989);
T. Egeler et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** 1804 (1990);
T.Daniel et al, Phys.Rev.Lett **66** 2657 (1991).
- [3] S.Das Sarma and W.Y.Lai, Phys. Rev. B **32**, 140 (1985);
W.Y.Lai and S.Das Sarma, ibid **33**, 8874 (1986);
W.Y.Lai, A.Kobayashi and S.Das Sarma, ibid **34**, 7380 (1986);
W.M.Que and G.Kirczenow, ibid **37**, 7153 (1988);
Q.Li and S.Das Sarma, ibid **40**, 5860 (1989);
Q.Li, S.Das Sarma and R.Joynt, ibid **45** 13713 (1992);
T.Ogawa, A.Furusaki and N.Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett **68**, 3638 (1992);
D.K.K.Lee and Y.Chen, ibid 69, 1399 (1992).
- [4] S.Tomonaga, Prog. Theor. Phys. **5**, 544 (1950);
J.Luttinger, J. Math. Phys. **4**, 1154 (1963).

- [5] D.Mattis and E.Lieb, J. Math. Phys. **6**, 304 (1965).
- [6] F.Haldane, J.Phys.C:Solid State Phys **14**, 2585 (1981).
- [7] A.Plaut, H.Lage, P.Grambow, D.Heitmann, K.von Klitzing and K.Ploog, Phys. Rev.Lett.**67**,1642 (1991);
A.Goñi, A.Pinczuk, J.Weiner, J.Calleja, B.Dennis, L.Pfeiffer and K.West, Phys. Rev. Lett.**67**, 3298 (1991);
J.Calleja, A.Goñi, B.Dennis, J.Weiner, A.Pinczuk, S.Schmidt-Rink, L.Pfeiffer, K.West, J.Muller and A.Ruckenstein, Solid State Commun. **79**, 911 (1991).
- [8] C.M.Naón, M.C.von Reichenbach and M.L.Trobo, Nucl.Phys.B **435** [FS], 567 (1995).
- [9] B.Hu and S.Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 5469 (1993).
- [10] E.Fradkin, F.Schaposnik and M.C. von Reichenbach, Nucl. Phys. **B** [FS] **316**, 710 (1989).
- [11] J.Sólyom, Adv.in Phys. **28**, 201 (1979).
- [12] R.Gamboa-Saraví, F.Schaposnik and J.Solomin, Nucl. Phys. B **185**, 239 (1981);
K.Furuya, R.Gamboa-Saraví and F.Schaposnik, Nucl. Phys.B **208**, 159 (1982).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Three regions in the first quadrant of the s, t plane. In I FL behavior is forbidden. In III the Fermi edge is restored for $r(s, t)$ given by Eq.(16). In II SDW's are absent.